

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/542,714

Applicant(s)

HAVEMOSE, ALLAN

Examiner

Tuan A Vu

Art Unit

2124

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A Vu.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Malinowski ( reg # 43423).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 November 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7, 13 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants has proposed via Email correspondence that some claims can be cancelled for making the invention in condition for allowance. Examiner has replied that the issue was not that a particular set of claims are being more patentable over others but that a specific limitation in the independent claims are not claimed so as to enable the remaining body of those claims to distinguish over the art of record. Also indicated in the reply was that a rejection has been written up in view of the interview of 11/21/03 the week before.